

**STATE OF NEW YORK DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SERVICE**

**THREE EMPIRE STATE PLAZA, ALBANY, NY 12223-1350**

**PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION**

JOHN F. O'MARA  
Chairman  
LISA ROSENBLUM  
Deputy Chairman

HAROLD A. JERRY, JR.  
WILLIAM D. COTTER  
EUGENE W. ZELTMANN



MAUREEN O. HELMER  
General Counsel

JOHN C. CRARY  
Secretary

May 6, 1996

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

RECEIVED  
MAY 7 1996  
FCC MAIL ROOM

William F. Caton, Acting Secretary  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20554

Re: Federal-State Joint Board on  
Universal Service -- CC Docket No. 96-45

Dear Secretary Caton:

The New York State Department of Public Service (NYDPS) submits these reply comments to the initial comments submitted by parties to the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking and Order Establishing Joint Board ("Notice") released March 8, 1996.

Our reply comments focus on the following questions raised in the Commission's notice: (1) whether to eliminate or reduce the carrier common line (CCL) charge and, instead, permit LECs to recover these costs directly from end users through an increase in the subscriber line charge (SLC); (2) whether passage of the Act should change the existing division of responsibility between the interstate and intrastate jurisdictions for contributions to support universal service; (3) whether the states should determine reporting measures necessary to ensure service quality; and (4) whether the states should administer the distribution of universal service funding.<sup>1</sup>

The New York State Department of Public Service supports the Commission in its efforts to decrease the CCL, but we believe that an attendant increase in the SLC is unwarranted. Increases in end user rates should not be necessary in view of changing market conditions. We believe that continued growth in interstate access minutes (if volume growth exceeds cost growth, as it should, then per minute rates should decrease) will

---

<sup>1</sup>. MCI and Teleport raise arguments that certain interconnection arrangements (referred to "pay or play") are inconsistent under the Act. NYDPS will comment on such interconnection arrangements in Docket No. 96-98, where this issue is also being addressed.

NYDPS  
FCC MAIL ROOM

D-10

necessarily reduce the per minute cost to the local exchange company and that increasing competitive pressures should create greater efficiencies.<sup>2</sup> Recent telecommunications industry downsizing underscores this point. Finally, changes in market structure, new opportunities and competitive pressures should encourage the incumbents to consider other approaches.

The NYDPS concurs with the initial comments<sup>3</sup> of many parties who oppose the proposal to increase the end user subscriber line charge (SLC). There is no evidence to support an increase in the SLC even were the Commission to determine that interstate carrier common line (CCL) charges should be eliminated or reduced. In fact, at least one party requests that the Commission consider reductions in the SLC because of declining loop costs and increased productivity over the past decade.<sup>4</sup>

Regarding the proposed use of intrastate revenues for an interstate universal service fund,<sup>5</sup> Congress has clearly stated otherwise in the Act. Section 254(d), for example, states categorically, "(E)very telecommunications carrier that provides interstate telecommunications services shall contribute to the specific (universal service fund) established by the Commission." (Emphasis added.) This provision makes no reference either to intrastate services or intrastate carriers. Particularly when read with Section 601(c), it cannot be construed as endorsing the use of intrastate revenue for interstate universal services. Moreover, Sections 601 and 254(d) must be read in concert with

---

2. Interstate switched access minutes have exhibited significant and consistent growth since their inception. Continuation of that growth trend would result in additional usage growth of 30% or more over the next five years and would allow a 15-20% decrease in interstate switched access rates from growth alone. Adding continued productivity gains (currently running at about 3% over and above inflation) and transferring competitive risks to access providers could result in another 20% or more in expected price decreases. Full examination of these potential price reductions should precede any consideration of funding access price reductions from local service increases.

3. See, e.g., Comments of National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners, p. 3; Florida Public Service Commission, p. 23; Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission; John Staurulakis, Inc., p. 13; American Association of Retired Persons, Consumer Federation of America and Consumers Union, p. 16; Texas Public Utilities Commission, p. 18; MCI Communications Corporation, p. 14.

4. See, e.g., Comments of the Texas Office of Public Utility Counsel, page 14.

5. See, e.g., Comments of the National Cable Television Association and AT&T.

Congress's preservation of Section 152(b). Inasmuch as the Commission remains expressly barred from setting intrastate rates, it cannot simply appropriate intrastate revenues for federal purposes.

In addition, Section 254(d) must be read with Section 254(f) which authorizes each state to adopt regulations consistent with the Commission's own rules on universal services. The same provision specifies that "(E)very telecommunications carrier that provides intrastate telecommunications services shall contribute in a manner determined by the State to. . .universal service in that State." (Emphasis added.) These provisions speak pointedly of Congress's intent to use only interstate revenue support for interstate universal services.

Similarly, the suggestion by MCI<sup>6</sup> that the Joint Board and the Commission somehow create a higher burden for any state that seeks to impose service quality reporting requirements on new entrants (equivalent to those of incumbent LECs), disregards the plain meaning of pertinent provisions in the Act. As MCI's comment itself acknowledges, service quality oversight has historically been the responsibility of the states. Having originally acknowledged (in Section 152(b)) that the states are the appropriate venues for such responsibility, Congress has clearly reaffirmed and preserved this jurisdictional delegation at Section 252(e)(3) of the Act.

The NYDPS supports the initial comments of parties that would authorize the state regulatory commissions to act as administrators of the distribution of universal service funds.<sup>7</sup> As we stated in our initial comments, funds could be distributed to each state in the form of a "block grant." We agree that states are in a better position to establish distribution plans because they possess in-depth knowledge of the local marketplace and can better target areas in need of subsidy. Specifically, state commissions have extensive knowledge of the rate design and cost structure of each local exchange company as well as knowledge of high cost areas, areas of low subscribership, and the degree of competition within the state.

In fact, certain states (e.g., California and Vermont) have established intrastate universal funds and maintain that having state utility commissions perform this role for the Commission could provide for a more seamless targeting of support for universal service.<sup>8</sup> We agree that states should have the flexibility to select a third party administrator of the fund, as

---

<sup>6</sup>. Comments of MCI Communications Corporation, page 21.

<sup>7</sup>. See, e.g., Comments of Time Warner Communications Holdings, Inc., p. 23.; Comments of Bell Atlantic, p. 10.

<sup>8</sup>. See, e.g., Comments of the California Public Utilities Commission.

long as oversight is maintained. For example, if a particular state lacks the resources or expertise to act as administrator, an independent third party could be hired, through a competitive bidding process, to collect and distribute the funds. The third party administrator could distribute funds in accordance with state and federal policies, provide annual accounting reports, and hold its records open for state review.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Maureen O. Helmer". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Maureen" being more prominent than the last name "Helmer".

Maureen O. Helmer  
General Counsel  
New York State Department  
of Public Service  
Three Empire State Plaza  
Albany, NY 12223-1350  
(518) 474-1585

Dated: May 6, 1996  
Albany, New York

**CC DOCKET NO. 96-45**  
**UNIVERSAL SERVICE**  
**JOINT BOARD SERVICE LIST**

The Honorable Reed E. Hundt  
Chairman  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, N.W. -- Room 814  
Washington, D.C. 20554

The Honorable Andrew C. Barrett  
Commissioner  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, N.W. -- Room 826  
Washington, D.C. 20554

The Honorable Susan Ness  
Commissioner  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, N.W. -- Room 832  
Washington, D.C. 20554

The Honorable Julia Johnson  
Commissioner  
Florida Public Service Commission  
Capital Circle Office Center  
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.  
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

The Honorable Kenneth McClure  
Vice Chairman  
Missouri Public Service Commission  
301 W. High Street, Suite 530  
Jefferson City, MO 65102

The Honorable Sharon L. Nelson  
Chairman  
Washington Utilities and Transportation  
Commission  
P.O. Box 47250  
Olympia, WA 98504-7250

The Honorable Laska Schoenfelder  
Commissioner  
South Dakota  
Public Utilities Commission  
500 E. Capital Avenue  
Pierre, SD 57501

Martha S. Hogerty  
Public Counsel for  
the State of Missouri  
P.O. Box 7800  
Harry S. Truman Building, Room 250  
Jefferson City, MO 65102

Deborah Dupont, Federal Staff Chair  
Federal Communications Commission  
2000 L Street, N.W., Suite 257  
Washington, D.C. 20036

Paul E. Pederson, State Staff Chair  
Missouri Public Service Commission  
P.O. Box 360  
Truman State Office Building  
Jefferson City, MO 65102

Eileen Benner  
Idaho Public Utilities Commission  
P.O. Box 83720  
Boise, ID 83720-0074

Charles Bolle  
South Dakota  
Public Utilities Commission  
State Capital  
500 E. Capital Avenue  
Pierre, SD 57501-5070

William Howden  
Federal Communications Commission  
2000 L Street, N.W., Suite 812  
Washington, D.C. 20036

Lorraine Kenyon  
Alaska Public Utilities Commission  
1016 West Sixth Avenue, Suite 400  
Anchorage, AK 99501

Debra M. Kriete  
Pennsylvania Public  
Utilities Commission  
P.O. Box 3265  
Harrisburg, PA 17105-3265

Clara Kuehn  
Federal Communications Commission  
2000 L Street, N.W. Suite 257  
Washington, D.C. 20036

Mark Long  
Florida Public Service Commission  
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.  
Gerald Gunter Building  
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0850

Samuel Loudenslager  
Arkansas Public Service Commission  
P.O. Box 400  
Little Rock, AR 72203-0400

Sandra Makeeff  
Iowa Utilities Board  
Lucas State Office Building  
Des Moines, IA 50319

Philip F. McClelland  
Pennsylvania Office  
of Consumer Advocate  
1425 Strawberry Square  
Harrisburg, PA 17120

Michael A. McRae  
D.C. Office of the People's Counsel  
1133 15th Street, N.W. -- Suite 500  
Washington, D.C. 20005

Rafi Mohammed  
Federal Communications Commission  
2000 L Street, N.W., Suite 812  
Washington, D.C. 20036

Terry Monroe  
New York Public Service Commission  
Three Empire Plaza  
Albany, NY 12223  
**INTERAGENCY**

Andrew Mulitz  
Federal Communications Commission  
2000 L Street, N.W., Suite 257  
Washington, D.C. 20036

Mark Nadel  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, N.W., Room 542  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Gary Oddi  
Federal Communications Commission  
2000 L Street, N.W., Suite 257  
Washington, D.C. 20036

Theresa Pitts  
Washington Utilities  
and Transportation Commission  
P.O. Box 47250  
Olympia, WA 98504-7250

Jeanine Poltronieri  
Federal Communications Commission  
2000 L Street, N.W., Suite 257  
Washington, D.C. 20036

James Bradford Ramsay  
National Association of  
Regulatory Utility Commissioners  
1201 Constitution Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20423

Jonathan Reel  
Federal Communications Commission  
2000 L. Street, N.W., Suite 257  
Washington, D.C. 20036

Brian Roberts  
California Public  
Utilities Commission  
505 Van Ness Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94102-3298

Gary Seigel  
Federal Communications Commission  
2000 L Street, N.W., Suite 812  
Washington, D.C. 20036

Pamela Szymczak  
Federal Communications Commission  
2000 L Street, N.W., Suite 257  
Washington, D.C. 20036

Whiting Thayer  
Federal Communications Commission  
2000 L Street, N.W., Suite 812  
Washington, D.C. 20036

Deborah S. Waldbaum  
Colorado Office of Consumer General  
1580 Logan Street, Suite 610  
Denver, CO 80203

Alex Belinfante  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20554

Larry Povich  
Federal Communications Commission  
1919 M Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20554